SEMINOLE COUNTY GOVERNMENT AGENDA MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: <u>Professional Services: PS-4053-08/RTB - Architectural and Engineering Services</u> for Seminole County Fire Stations

DEPARTMENT: Administrative Services **DIVISION:** Purchasing and Contracts

AUTHORIZED BY: Frank Raymond **CONTACT:** Robert Bradley **EXT:**

MOTION/RECOMMENDATION:

Approve ranking list and authorize staff to negotiate rates for PS-4053-08/RTB - Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Fire Stations with C.T. HSU and Associates P.A., of Orlando, FL. (Estimated Usage Amount of \$500,000.00 over the term of the Agreement)

County-wide Ray Hooper

BACKGROUND:

PS-4053-08/RTB will provide architectural and engineering services for the design of Seminole County fire stations. These services will include, but not be limited to, architectural, structural, mechanical, electrical, systems, civil, fire protection, cost engineering, interior design, irrigation and landscape design.

The project was publicly advertised and the County received nineteen (19) submittals (listed below alphabetically), of which one (1) response was determined to be non-responsive.

- Architects Design Group, Inc.
- Bentley Architects & Engineers, Inc.
- Bergmann Associates, Inc.
- CPH Engineers, Inc.
- CSA Group (CSA Central, Inc.)
- C.T. HSU & Associates, P.A.
- Cuhaci & Peterson Architects, LLC
- DLR Group, Inc.
- Harlin Locklin & Associates, Inc.
- KBJ Architects, Inc.
- MLM-Martin Architects, Inc.
- Pavlik Design Team
- Reynolds Smith & Hills
- Rhodes & Brito Architects, Inc.

- Rick Swisher Architect, Inc.
- The Scott Partnership Architects
- Starmer Ranaldi Planning and Architecture, Inc.
- Steven Hutchins Architects
- Stottler Stagg & Associates, Inc.

The Evaluation Committee, which consisted of Frank Raymond, Administrative Services Director; Scott Werley, Construction Manager; Ed Bayton, Fleet and Facilities Manager, all from the Administrative Services Department, and Terry Winn, Assistant Fire Chief, Public Safety, evaluated the submittals and agreed to short-list three (3) firms. The Evaluation Committee interviewed these firms giving consideration to the following criteria:

- Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures to provide the County with tangible evidence of their abilities.
- Present methods and examples of cost control.
- Present methods on meeting or exceeding the design schedule.
- Prove detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and firm's ability to adapt the design to other sites.

The attached backup documentation includes the Bid Tabulation, the Presentation Summary & Scoring Sheets, the Evaluation Summary Sheet and the Project Scope. The Evaluation Committee recommends that the Board approve the ranking below and authorize staff to negotiate rates with the top ranked firm in accordance with F.S. 287.055, the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA)

- C.T. HSU & Associates, P.A.
- Architects Design Group, Inc.
- Bentley Architects & Engineers, Inc.

Staff will return to present the final negotiated rates and the Award Agreement for approval and execution by the Board. Authorization for the performance of services by the Consultant under this Master Agreement shall be in the form of written Work Orders issued and executed by the County, and signed by the Consultants. The work and dollar amount for each Work Order shall be negotiated on as as-needed basis for the specific project, and funded within approved budget amounts. Funds are identified in Fire Station 29 (Account #010577.560650, CIP #0258001).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Board approve ranking list and authorize staff to negotiate rates for PS-4053-08/RTB - Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Fire Stations with C.T. HSU and Associates P.A., of Orlando, FL. (Estimated Usage Amount of \$500,000.00 over the term of the Agreement)

ATTACHMENTS:

1. PS-4053-08_RTB - Backup Documentation

Additionally Reviewed By:

County Attorney Review (Ann Colby)

B.C.C. - SEMINOLE COUNTY, FL **PS TABULATION SHEET**

PS-4053-08/RTB PS NUMBER: A & E Services for Seminole County Fire Stations PS TITLE

ALL SUBMITTALS ACCEPTED BY SEMINOLE COUNTY ARE SUBJECT TO THE COUNTY'S TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND ANY AND ALL ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS SUBMITTED BY THE PROPOSERS ARE REJECTED AND SHALL HAVE NO FORCE AND EFFECT. PS DOCUMENTS FROM THE PROPOSERS LISTED HEREIN ARE THE ONLY SUBMITTALS RECEIVED TIMELY AS OF THE ABOVE OPENING DATE AND TIME. ALL OTHER PS DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THIS SOLICITATION, IF ANY, ARE HEREBY REJECTED AS LATE.

DATE: January 7, 2009 @ 2:00 PM	@ 2:00 PM		
RESPONSE -1-	RESPONSE -2-	RESPONSE -3-	RESPONSE -4
Architects Design Group, Inc.	Bentley Architects & Engineers, Inc.	Bergmann Associates, Inc.	CPH Engineers, Inc.
PO Box 1210	665 W. Warren Avenue	8653 Baypine Road, Suite 100	500 West Fulton Street
Winter Park, FL 324790	Longwood, FI 32750	Jacksonville, FL 32256	Sanford, FI 32771
		-	
Kevin Ratigan, Senior V.P.	Gary Kranston, Vice President	Joseph J. Istvan, PIC	Gerald M. Cox, Vice President
Ph: 407-647-1706	Ph: 407-331-6116	Ph: 800-724-1168	Ph: 407-322-6841
Fax: 407-645-5525	Fax: 407-331-4566	Fax:904-363-3203	Fax: 407-330-0639
RESPONSE -5-	RESPONSE -6-	RESPONSE -7-	RESPONSE -8
CSA Group (CSA Central, Inc.)	C.T. HSU & Associates, P.A.	Cuhaci & Peterson Architects, LLC	DLR Group, Inc.
2828 Edgewater Drive, Suite 200	820 Irma Avenue	1220 Alden Road	100 East Pine Street, Suite 404
Orlando, FL 32804	Orlando, FL 32803	Orlando, FL 32803-2546	Orlando, FL 32801
Milliam F Brown	†*************************************	Oist O	
07 MINIMALI F. DIOWII, JI., VICE FIES.	O.I. HSU, Plesidelli Br. 407 422 0009	Office Reflegal, Alcilled Studio Mgl	IVIICITAEI, E. LEBOEUI, FIIIICIPAI Db. 407 649 4224
Fax:407-649-8190	F1I. 407-423-0038 Fax:407-423-4793	FII: 40/-904-9100 Fax:407-661-9101	F11. 407-648-1331 Fax:407-648-1433
RESPONSE -9-	RESPONSE -10-	RESPONSE -11-	RESPONSE -12
Harlin Locklin & Associates, Inc.	KBJ Architects, Inc.	MLM-Martin Architects, Inc.	Pavlik Design Team
850 Courtland Street	539 Delaney Avenue	668 N. Orlando Avenue, Ste 107	6451 N. Federal Highway, Ste 1000
Orlando, FL 32804	Orlando, FL 32801	Maitland, FL 32751	Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308
	9 Neuronal		
Hugh W. Harling, Jr., President	** Nor-Kest	Miguel Martin, President	Mark Hammil, Principal
Ph: 407-629-1061		Ph: 407-897-6764	Ph: 954-523-3300
Fax:407-629-2855	Craig A. Kirkwood, AIA, Principal	Fax;407-894-1338	Fax:954-523-2521
	Ph: 407-839-5501		
	Fax:407-839-0668		
RESPONSE -13-	RESPONSE -14	RESPONSE -15-	RESPONSE -16
Reynolds Smith & Hills	Rhodes & Brito Architects, Inc.	Rick Swisher Architect, Inc.	The Scott Partnership Architects
1000 Legion Place, Ste 800	604 North Magnolia Avenue	2693 W. Fairbanks Avenue	429 S. Keller Road, Suite 200
Orlando, FL 32801	Orlando, FL 32801	Winter Park, FL 32789	Orlando, FL 32810
:			
James R. Avitabile, Vice President Ph: 407-893-5800	Ruffin Rhodes, AIA, Principal Ph: 407-648-7288	Cindy Swisher, Secretary/Treasurer Ph: 407-644-3003	Raymond Scott, AIA, CEO Ph: 407-660-2766
Fax:407-648-2128	Fax:407-648-7289	Fax:407-644-4703	Fax:407-875-3276

Page 2 of 2

RESPONSE -17-	RESPONSE -18-	RESPONSE -19-
Starmer Ranaldi Planning and	Steven Hutchins Architects	Stottler Stagg & Associates, Inc.
Architecture, Inc.	9143 Philips Hwy, Ste 140	8680 North Atlantic Avenue
820 W. Broadway Street, Ste. 3000 Jacksonville, Fl 32256	Jacksonville, FI 32256	Cape Canaveral, FL 32920
Oviedo, FL 32765		
Joseph Ranaldi, Vice Pres	Steven E. Hutchins, Principal	Albino P. Campanini, CEO
Ph: 407-977-1080	Ph: 904-538-9615	Ph: 321-783-1320
Fax:407-9771019	Fax:904-538-9617	Fax:321-783-7065

Tabulated by: Robert T. Bradley, Procurement Analyst, January 8, 2009

Robert T. Bradley, Procurement Analyst, January 13, 2009 Updated by:

**Exceeded page count for the Appendix

Evaluation Committee Meeting: January 29, 2009

C.T. HSU & Associates, P.A. Short listed Firms:

Bentley Architects & Engineers, Inc.

Architects Design Group, Inc.

Presentations Date and Time: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 @ 10:00 AM

10:00 - 10:30am 10:45 - 11:15am Bentley Architects and Engineers, Inc. C.T. HSU & Associates, P.A. Schedule

11:30 - 12:00pm Architects Design Group, Inc.

Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site Criteria: (30 points)

accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures

to provide The County with tangible evidence of their abilities.

Present methods and examples of cost control (25 points)

Present methods on meeting or exceeding the design schedule. (15 points)

Sive your detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and your firm's ability to adapt the design to other sites (15 points)

Elaborate on your firm's stance on the County's desire to re-use the same design for multiple stations (15 points) BCC Agenda Date - Request to Approve Ranking and Authorize Negotiations with the top firm: March 10, 2009

(Updated by Robert Bradley, Procurement Analyst, February 18, 2009)

1. C.T. HSU

Bentley Architects and Engineers 2. Architects Design Group 3. Bentley Architects and El

PS-4053-08/RTB - Architectural and Engineering Serives for Seminole County

Fire Stations Presentation Rankings

DATE

2/17/2009 10:00 AM Eastern

Ranking	-	3	2
Total	4	1	σ.
Terry Winn		3	6
Ed Bayton	*****	2	C
Frank Raymond		3	0
Scott Werley		3	2

We approve the above stated ranking:

Architects Design Group

Bentley Architects

C.T. Hsu

Scert Werley
Scott Werley
August August Raymond

Ed Bayton

Terry Winn

Presentation Evaluation
SUBJECT: PS-4053-08/RTB – A & E Services for Seminole County Fire

Stations

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: C.T. Hsu
QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: _ Scott Werley
INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines: • Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings • Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. • Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is • Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications • Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable
Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.
Criteria: Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures to provide The County with tangible evidence of their abilities. (30 pts) I MAC 5the County Site Normal Site Representation of the second site of th
Instituted fift well us. CMV, Metal Ronf for Cout 3
Score <u>30</u> (0-30)
Criteria: Present methods and examples of cost control (25 pts) Winter Corden - 3 bes Delve true Zud Cost - Et O Sir Const-Cost
oc - Refuse cost U/ D site met! Score 22 (0-25)
Criteria: Present methods on meeting or exceeding the design schedule. (15 pts)
4-5 ments design dina
Score <u>/2</u> (0-15)
Criteria: Give your detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and your firm's ability to adapt the design to other sites. (15 pts)
Rolocks - A response Rolocke mach A = Chilency
Reduce to specific a discharge
Score <u>/く</u> (0-15)
Criteria: Elaborate on your firm's stance on the County's desire to re-use the same design for multiple stations. (15 pts)
Fundlis W R-use agreements
Score/ <u><</u> (0-15)
Ranking Total Score (0-100)

SUBJECT:		resentation Ev B – A & E Se		nole County Fire
SUBMITTAL CO	MPANY NAME:	Bentley A	rchitects & Eng	ineers
			e Ildia A	
			softwerley	
total number of general guidelin OutstanExceller	points for all criter nes: iding, out-of-the-bo nt, Very Good, Soli	ox, Innovative, id in all respec	l00 points based of Cost/Time Savings ts.	_
,	No major weakness al, Weak, Workable	•	•	
•	n, vveak, vvorkable ptable, Needs maj			
- 0/14000	prable, stoode maj	J. , , J. P. CO . J. G.		
	be any strengths, or each of the abo		and deficiencies t luation criteria.	to support your
methods and exa provide samples to provide The C	amples on prototypic or examples of doc county with tangible o	cal plans & Site a umentation, of to evidence of their	abilities. (30 pts)	epresentatives are to cesses and procedures
0V3 45 42 42	10 - 54W/4 10 /	outotope _	. <i>PD</i>	Mad 11/2 ml
Mus Crain	1 200 And	That Tay E. P.C.C.	for d has to	Metal Root CMV - more flex; blk
	t methods and exam		Score	2 53 (0-30)
		•	ubulsalun miles	ton res
cm? v	E			> Zud Cost
_ ch vs. b	terdbid piecer	CM Prec	vel wheed blo	<u>23</u> (0-25)
	,		Score	<u>23</u> (0-25)
		ng or exceeding	the design schedule	. (15 pts)
30/60/90		00	- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1-	
	<u> </u>			
			Score	<u>13</u> (0-15)
ability to adapt the	he design to other si	tes. (15 pts)		e County and your firm's
Muse me	ich rom	L	ngwood Italis & Y	takee teke
FILE WE	dwall		Score	<u> 14</u> (0-15)
Criteria: Elabora multiple stations	-	ance on the Cou		the same design for
	25 DU 7090 il	f besicully som	ne	
			Score	1 <u>/8</u> (0-15)

Ranking____

		entation Evaluation – A & E Services for Seminole County Fire
		Architects Design Group
QUALIFICATION	I COMMITTEE MEN	MBER: Scott Werley
INSTRUCTIONS total number of p general guideline	E: Score each criterion oints for all criterion es: ing, out-of-the-box, lowers Good, Solid in major weaknesses Weak, Workable bu	on up to the number of points allotted for each. The will equal 100 points based on the following Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
		eaknesses and deficiencies to support your stated evaluation criteria.
methods and examprovide samples of to provide The Cou	nples on prototypical processive and protocology of the comments of the contract of the contra	hin the original submittal for this project, and discuss plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to entation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures ence of their abilities. (30 pts)
050 es/6 Can	why - kit of Paits	petel hut conment melti-critica
Jeek Tevenmer		
atck Bethvech		Score (0-30)
Criteria: Present n	nethods and example	s of cost control (25 pts)
se outside	C b d	experimental tres
Sysphementel	they a great	exprortal tres
CM VS 1-14	= 4.61 el	Score _ 24_ (0-25)
<u>kiso, decu</u>	mutobility	r exceeding the design schedule. (15 pts)
AREGO TIME	- = 5hot ex 3/24	contic Varia la mas
		Score(0-15)
Criteria: Give your ability to adapt the	r detailed opinion of the design to other sites.	ne bubble diagram provided by the County and your firm's (15 pts)
Best needs	sure Chesons	
		Score <u>14</u> (0-15)
multiple stations. (15 pts)	on the County's desire to re-use the same design for
Const. Do	ce 81d plucess	civil from scholch

Total Score (0-100) _____ ⁹ ²____

Score _____(0-15)

Ranking____

Presentation Evaluation PS-4053-08/RTB - A & E Services for Seminole County Fire SUBJECT: **Stations Bentley Architects & Engineers** SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines: Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications Unacceptable. Needs major help to be acceptable Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria. Criteria: Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures to provide The County with tangible evidence of their abilities. (30 pts) Score $\sqrt{3}$ (0-30) Criteria: Present methods and examples of cost control (25 pts) quilibration spaces . - OK y Noord Score Score Criteria: Give your detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and your firm's ability to adapt the design to other sites. (15 pts)

Criteria: Elaborate on your firm's stance on the County's desire to re-use the same design for multiple stations. (15 pts)

If Classian 15 Hu Saur > was 38% of Ontgome, place down

approx 1800 pure designs-

Score <u>//</u> (0-15)

Ranking Total Score (0-100)

100) _______

Presentation Evaluation
PS-4053-08/RTB – A & E Services for Seminole County Fire

SUBJECT:

Stations
SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: C.T. Hsu
QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: F. Kaymond
INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines: • Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings • Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. • Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is • Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications • Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable
Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.
Criteria: Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures to provide The County with tangible evidence of their abilities. (30 pts) Provo type (40 ft angle 60 ft ang
Score <u>17</u> (0-30)
Criteria: Present methods and examples of cost control (25 pts) Grad Grand of S. Good hands by Castan is with the Market of the Market of the Castan is with the Market of the Castan is with the Castan in the Market of the Castan in the Cas
Susabulore my Mile three - Anthe copies 5 mos. Mes aga tome
Score <u>/ 4</u> (0-15)
Criteria: Give your detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and your firm's ability to adapt the design to other sites. (15 pts)
Score <u>/// (</u> 0-15)
Criteria: Elaborate on your firm's stance on the County's desire to re-use the same design for multiple stations, (15 pts) And County's desire to re-use the same design for multiple stations, (15 pts) Note of Plans Score 14 (0-15)
Ranking Total Score (0-100)

Presentation Evaluation SUBJECT: PS-4053-08/RTB – A & E Services for Seminole County Fire Stations
SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Architects Design Group
QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Frank Kan mand
INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines: Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable
Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.
Criteria: Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures to provide The County with tangible evidence of their abilities. (30 pts) Ascola County Fair Continue USCs Breezeway County from Strong for Market Strong for Fair County for Score (0-30)
Criteria: Present methods and examples of cost control (25 pts)
Luca Risk " Reland Conflood, But It work moss! -
Score 17 (0-25)

Criteria: Present methods on meeting or exceeding the design schedule. (15 pts) Strategister D. A. Serge - Not Much bellevil for these Keeper on Children - Cols stress Keeper on Children
Tente of must funding helps for I mount ill Muston Sulfact.
Criteria: Give your detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and your firm's
ability to adapt the design to other sites. (15 pts)
decon Fore - 6 MAS
Score 1 3 (0-15)

Criteria: Elaborate on your firm's stance on the County's desire to re-use the same design for multiple stations. (15 pts)

ou puller come descript usually

Score $\frac{15}{(0-15)}$

Ranking____ Total Score (0-100) ____

SUBJECT:		resentation E		inole County Fire
SUBMITTAL CO	MPANY NAME:	C.T. Hsu		
QUALIFICATIO	N COMMITTEE I	MEMBER: <u>E</u>	BAYTO.	<u>N</u>
total number of general guidelin Outstand Excellen	points for all crite es:	rion will equal ox, Innovative, lid in all respec	100 points based of Cost/Time Saving ts.	
 Marginal 	i, Weak, Workab otable, Needs ma	le but needs cla	rifications	
Please describ assessment fo	e any strengths r each of the ab	, weaknesses ove stated eva	and deficiencies Iluation criteria.	to support your
methods and exa provide samples to provide The Co	mples on prototyp or examples of do ounty with tangible	ical plans & Site cumentation, of to evidence of thei	accommodations; R pols, techniques, pro r abilities. (30 pts)	project, and discuss epresentatives are to ocesses and procedures
			LA WIND	
MUCH FE	XITER DENCE			***************************************
			Score	<u>30</u> (0-30)
	methods and examination		ntrol (25 pts)	:
			Score	e <u>20</u> (0-25)
			the design schedule	
MAYBE 3	MONTHS DE	SEGN TEM	Ž	
	Marine and the second s		Score	e <u>/√</u> (0-15)
ability to adapt th	e desian to other s	sites. (15 pts)		he County and your firm's
			Scor	e <u>/</u> 5 (0-15)
Criteria: Elabora		tance on the Coเ	ınty's desire to re-us	se the same design for

Score 15 (0-15)

Ranking____

Total Score (0-100) _____

Presentation Evaluation PS-4053-08/RTB - A & E Services for Seminole County Fire SUBJECT: Stations SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Bentley Architects & Engineers QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: ED BAYTON INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines: Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings • Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. · Good. No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is • Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications • Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria. Criteria: Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures to provide The County with tangible evidence of their abilities. (30 pts) INLESS OUTSIDE WHERE PATH ON PRIME GOOD HANDIE ON CIVIL METAL REST & SHAPE, CMJ Score 25 (0-30) Criteria: Present methods and examples of cost control (25 pts) COST CONSULTANT, LOTS OF USER IMPUT, LIKES CM Score _23_ (0-25) Criteria: Present methods on meeting or exceeding the design schedule. (15 pts) IN HOUSE CIVIL ONE DOCUMENT TRACKENG. PS PROCRAMMENT GUERE MORK IN PUT TERE UP FRONT IN HOUSE STRUCTURAL Score /5 (0-15) Criteria: Give your detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and your firm's ability to adapt the design to other sites. (15 pts) Criteria: Elaborate on your firm's stance on the County's desire to re-use the same design for multiple stations. (15 pts)

ob or of	ICTMOR FER	E OLIV	VE GASAGEL	1 ATP	1,800
Poro Typic	OWNER DO	755 MOS	PRY 2ND	C057	
				Score /@	¬> (∩_15)

Ranking

Total Score (0-100) _____

Presentation Evaluation

SUBJECT: PS-4053-08/RTB – A & E Services for Seminole County Fire Stations

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Architects Design Group

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Architects Design Group QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: ED BAYTON INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines: Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications • Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria. Criteria: Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures to provide The County with tangible evidence of their abilities. (30 pts) KIT OF PARTS GOOD THOUGHTS ON POOF DESILAN HERRA ALL CONSTALS SEMPLE CAN I STUCCO WILLOWA FOR PUBLIC SAFERRY **Score** *♂* (0-30) Criteria: Present methods and examples of cost control (25 pts) COST CONCULTANT GARAT FEXPERTIFICATE Score 25 (0-25) Criteria: Present methods on meeting or exceeding the design schedule. (15 pts) MILESTONES IS SCHROULE DISTATE 30 MODEL 6 MONTH NORMAL SCHEOUTE **Score** / Ø (0-15) Criteria: Give your detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and your firm's ability to adapt the design to other sites. (15 pts) PUBLIC PARKING SECUPLTY BUNK ARTER DIVERSTRY Score /O (0-15)

Score _/O (0-15)

Criteria: Elaborate on your firm's stance on the County's desire to re-use the same design for multiple stations. (15 pts)

Solo of OPTGTHING FIRE

LYD COST NOT BORNET BY OWNER

Score _/O (0-15)

Ranking

Total Score (0-100) _____

Stations
CT Hou
SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: C.T. Hsu
QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER:Terry Winn
INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines: Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable
Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.
Criteria: Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures to provide The County with tangible evidence of their abilities. (30 pts)
Score 25 (0-30)
Criteria: Present methods and examples of cost control (25 pts) (U) inter GAnden ZND cost control Clamport -
Score 20 (0-25)
Criteria: Present methods on meeting or exceeding the design schedule. (15 pts) 4-5 - 4 design 10 mould construction
Score 2 (0-15)
Criteria: Give your detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and your firm's ability to adapt the design to other sites. (15 pts)
Score /5 (0-15)

Criteria: Elaborate on your firm's stance on the County's desire to re-use the same design for multiple stations. (15 pts)

Ranking

Score _/ ___ (0-15)

Total Score (0-100) ______

Presentation Evaluation SUBJECT: PS-4053-08/RTB – A & E Services for Seminole County Fire Stations
SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Bentley Architects & Engineers
QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: TErry Winn
INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines: Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable
Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.
Criteria: Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedures to provide The County with tangible evidence of their abilities. (30 pts)
civil is in house component.
Score 22 (0-30) Criteria: Present methods and examples of cost control (25 pts)
<u> </u>
Score _/_ (0-25) Criteria: Present methods on meeting or exceeding the design schedule. (15 pts) Typical [2 month] Conduct In the conduct
Score(0-15) Criteria: Give your detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and your firm's ability to adapt the design to other sites. (15 pts) Score(0-15)
Criteria: Elaborate on your firm's stance on the County's desire to re-use the same design for
multiple stations. (15 pts) [Industrial 3 sites -

Ranking____ Total Score (0-100)

Presentation Evaluation SUBJECT: PS-4053-08/RTB – A & E Services for Seminole County Fin Stations	'e
SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Architects Design Group	
QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: TERM WWW	
INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines: Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable	The
Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.	
Criteria: Select one (1) project listed within the original submittal for this project, and discuss methods and examples on prototypical plans & Site accommodations; Representatives are to provide samples or examples of documentation, of tools, techniques, processes and procedute provide The County with tangible evidence of their abilities. (30 pts))
Osciela - Adapable for expansion (44)	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Score 76 (0-30) Criteria: Present methods and examples of cost control (25 pts)	
- Gon	
Score 20 (0-25)	
Criteria: Present methods on meeting or exceeding the design schedule. (15 pts)	
Score 14 (0-15)	
Criteria: Give your detailed opinion of the bubble diagram provided by the County and your ability to adapt the design to other sites. (15 pts) ASSUMD public meets norm Not on our Lid	irm's
Score 12 (0-15)	
Criteria: Elaborate on your firm's stance on the County's desire to re-use the same design for multiple stations. (15 pts)	r

Score <u>13</u> (0-15)

Total Score (0-100)

Ranking____

EVALUATION RANKINGSPS-4053-08/RTB - Architectural & Engineering Services for — Seminole County Fire Stations

Caroniac Sellitione	30	ひてなしよりいる				
	Scott Werley	Frank Raymond	Terry Winn	Ed Bayton	TOTAL POINTS	R
Architects Design Group, Inc.	თ	່ຕ	, 7	ဖ	20	က
Routley Architects & Funineers Inc	2	2	ო	7	တ	7
Bergmann Associates Inc.	14	œ	73	<u>උ</u>	20	5
OPH Engineers. Inc.		4	7	တ	27	4
CSA Group	12	13	4		40	0
CT HSI & Associates, Inc.	****	~	4	τ	4	~~
Cuhaci & Peterson Architects, LLC	15	12	12	4	53	<u>.</u>
DI R Group, Inno.	4	ιΩ		∞	28	۰
Harlin I ocklin & Associates, Inc	16	18	တ	13	99	_
M M-Martin Architects. Inc.	5	9	15	10	51	4
Pavlik Design Team	18	17	82	17	70	<u>&</u>
Revnolds Smith & Hills	80	တ	ဖ	4	27	K)
Rhodes & Brito Architects. Inc.	ო	5	ω	12	38	Con ·
Rick Swisher Architect. Inc.	13	ထ	14	5	38	o-
The Scott Partnership Architects	ιΩ	10	10	18	43	7
Starmer Ranaldi Planning and Architecture	*	7	16	ო	41	niverigo Calernos
Steven Hutchins Architects	17	41	IJ	16	52	<i>1</i> 50
Stottler Stagg & Associates, Inc.	9	7	-		37	-
The Evaluation Committee agrees to short-list the following:						
C.T. HSU & Associates, Inc.	₹-	~	~	₹	4	(- (
Bentley Architects & Engineers, Inc.	0	7	က	Ο (ത	Ν (
Architects Design Group, INc	0	m ا		O.	20	ઝ

Frank daymond

Scott Werley

Terry Winr

Ed Bayton

Scope of Services

Architectural and Engineering Serivces for Seminole County Fire Stations

Seminole County is seeking a consultant to provide Architectural and Engineering services for the design of Seminole County fire stations. The County has identified one (1) fire station located at Aloma Ave. and Loma Vista. Additional fire stations may be added at various other sites throughout the County.

The design for each site shall be based on the design criteria for Seminole County Fire Stations and the prototype floor plan for a three-bay 10,000 square foot station. The building and site plan will be adapted to the differing conditions on each site with the floor plan remaining approximately the same. The projects will be issued as indificual work orders to the selected consultant. All plans and specifications will be the property of Seminole County. The estimate construction cost is \$2,500,000.00 per fire station. Architectural and Engineering services will include, but not be limited to architectural, structural, mechanical, electrical, systems, civil, fire protection, cost engineering, interior design, irrigation and landscape design.

These services will also include Construction Procurement Services (including the production of Bid/Contract Documents, Drawings and Specifications, attendance at pre-bid meetings, etc.), Contract Administration Services (including reviewing change orders, pay applications, schedules, substitution requests, site visits, shop drawing and submittal review, RFI response, etc.) and Schedule Development and monitoring for design. Plan reviews awill be held at schematic development, design development, and construction development plans and specifications. The plan reviews will be at approximately 30%, 60%, 90%, and 100% stages of design.